



2013


The Relevance of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Nonviolence Philosophy to Diversity and Inclusion Efforts

Dorneshia L. Thomas

University of Kentucky, dorneshia.thomas@uky.edu

[Click here to let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/gaines_theses

 Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thomas, Dorneshia L., "The Relevance of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Nonviolence Philosophy to Diversity and Inclusion Efforts" (2013).
Gaines Fellow Senior Theses. 3.

https://uknowledge.uky.edu/gaines_theses/3

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Gaines Center for the Humanities at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Gaines Fellow Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@sv.uky.edu.

***The Relevance of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Nonviolence Philosophy to Diversity
and Inclusion Efforts***

Dorneshia L. Thomas

University of Kentucky

Gaines Center for the Humanities

Senior Thesis 2012-2013

4/4/2013

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to God for giving me the abilities needed to complete my thesis. I would like to thank my parents for giving me the opportunity to attend the University of Kentucky. I would also like to thank all of my family, friends, and mentors for their continued support.

Thesis committee members:

Dr. Gerald Smith, History

Dr. Richard Smith, Social Psychology

Dr. Arnold Farr, Philosophy

The Relevance of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Nonviolence Philosophy to Diversity and Inclusion Efforts

In 1967, in the book *Where do we go from here?: Chaos or Community*, Martin Luther King, Jr. expresses his opinion concerning the greatest new challenge that humanity must overcome. King states:

This is the great new problem of mankind. We have inherited a large house, a great "world house" in which we have to live together-black and white, Easterner and Westerner, Gentile and Jew, Catholic and Protestant, Moslem and Hindu-a family unduly separated in ideas, culture and interest, who, because we can never again live apart, must learn somehow to live with each other in peace. (King 177)

Many twenty-first century realities provide evidence that there is truth to King's twentieth-century claim of humanity's "great new problem" (King 177). I believe citizens of the twenty-first century understand what King is speaking of to be a problem of diversity and inclusion. The aim of this thesis is to show not only that King was accurate in identifying diversity and inclusion as one of mankind's greatest challenges, but that he also offered an effective means of dealing with the challenges of diversity and inclusion by way of his philosophy of nonviolence.

First, I will discuss some of the evidence that suggests that diversity and inclusion are indeed great challenges we are dealing with in this day and time, on multiple levels, and in various communities. Before I continue, however, it is important to define these terms. Diversity can be defined as having a community that consists of

members from “different identity groups” (Roberson 6). There are both internal and external measures of diversity. Diversity can be seen externally by considering such “things as gender, race, ethnicity, age”, and ability (Roberson 6). Internal diversity deals with such things as “cultural, cognitive and technical differences” (Roberson 6). Diversity highlights “the varied perspectives and approaches to work which members of different identity groups bring” (Roberson 6). Inclusion, on the other hand, can be defined as “the extent to which individuals can access information and resources, are involved in work groups, and have the ability to influence decision-making”(Roberson 6). Inclusion emphasizes someone’s capacity to “contribute fully and effectively to an organization” (Roberson 7).

Research has shown that there are many benefits and challenges to having communities that are diverse and inclusive (Roberson 8; Hurtado et al 2-3). For example, when institutions of learning are diverse and inclusive the educational experience of students is enhanced (Hurtado et al 2-3). It has also been shown that today’s workforce and schools “may be characterized by increased numbers of women, minorities, ethnic backgrounds, intergenerational workers and different lifestyles” (Roberson 2; Hurtado 187). Studies have shown that individuals from “diverse social and cultural groups are often excluded from networks of information and opportunity in organizations” (Roberson 6). Some executive leaders have “realized that the extent to which these demographic workforce changes are effectively and efficiently managed will impact organizational functioning and competitiveness” (Roberson 4). This realization has made managing diversity critical to the life of an organization and led over 75% of Fortune 1000 companies to establish efforts focused on diversity issues within their

organizations (Roberson 4). The major question is: how does one go about creating and sustaining diverse and inclusive communities? King further summarized these great challenges in saying:

All inhabitants of the Globe are now neighbors. This worldwide neighborhood has been brought into being largely as a result of the modern scientific and technological revolutions. The world today is vastly different from the world of just one hundred years ago...The large house in which we live demands that we transform this worldwide neighborhood into a worldwide brotherhood. Together we must learn to live as brothers or together we will be forced to perish as fools. (King 181)

The diversity and inclusion literature indicates that there are many challenges and unanswered questions when it comes to dealing with these issues. I believe Dr. It is my opinion that the nonviolence philosophy of Martin Luther King Jr, offers some profound insights on successfully dealing with diversity and inclusion issues. In order to effectively argue that King's philosophy is relevant to today's diversity and inclusion efforts, I will explain his philosophy in detail and the beliefs that motivated it. I will then talk about how training people in what is known as *Kingian Nonviolence Training* could prove to be beneficial to various communities in the areas of diversity and inclusion.

In 1944 Martin Luther King Jr. was "intellectually introduced" to nonviolent resistance as a freshman at Morehouse College .As a student, he read an essay written by Henry David Thoreau on civil disobedience (King 78). The writing had such an intense impact on King that he read it several times. King said that he was, "fascinated by the idea of refusing to cooperate with an evil system"(King 78). In spite of this early

exposure to nonviolent resistance, it was not until 1948, while a student at Crozer Theological Seminary, that King began a serious search for an effective way to rid the world of social evil (King 78). King began to entertain nonviolence as a useful method of eliminating evil when he heard a sermon given by Dr. Mordecai Johnson, who was the president of Howard University. Dr. Johnson had recently returned from a trip to India, and talked about the life and teachings of Mahatma Gandhi (King 23). King recounts the experience as follows: “His message was so profound and electrifying that I left the meeting and bought a half-dozen books on Gandhi’s life and work” (King 23).

While the occurrences mentioned above are what “intellectually introduced” King to nonviolent resistance, and led him to engage in an in-depth study of the topic, there are a number of other factors that must be taken into consideration and expounded upon in order to see the “big picture” of King’s philosophy (King 78). In fact, when King finished his academic training at Boston University in 1954, he professed no personal commitment to nonviolence. King says:

I ended my formal training with all of these relatively divergent intellectual forces converging into a positive social philosophy. One of the main tenets of this philosophy was the conviction that nonviolent resistance was one of the most potent weapons available to oppressed people in their quest for social justice. At this time, however, I had only a merely intellectual understanding and appreciation of the position, with no firm determination to organize it in a socially effective situation. (King 89)

It was not until a shift in his thinking occurred during the 1955 Montgomery bus boycott that he developed a personal commitment to nonviolence (Cone 76). According to

theologian James Cone, many have misinterpreted King's dedication to nonviolence because they have sought to understand it apart from his faith in God (Cone 128). Cone suggests Dr. King's theological beliefs were "the source of his absolute commitment to nonviolence" (Cone 128). Therefore, I will continue by discussing in detail Martin Luther King Jr.'s theological beliefs as they relate to his philosophy of nonviolence.

In his autobiography, King recalls the moment when he first experienced the pains of racial injustices. He tells a story about when he was informed that he would no longer be able to have a relationship with one of his best childhood friends, who was a white male. This was because his friend's father demanded that his son no longer play with the young Martin. The young Martin was very disturbed by this news, and he turned to his parents for understanding (King 7). King recalls his experience as follows:

We were at the dinner table when the situation was discussed, and here for the first time I was made aware of the existence of a race problem. I had never been conscious of it before. As my parents discussed some of the tragedies that had resulted from this problem and some of the insults they themselves had confronted on account of it, I was greatly shocked, and from that moment on I was determined to hate every white person. As I grew older and older this feeling continued to grow.

My parents would always tell me that I should not hate the white man, but that it was my duty as a Christian to love him. The question arose in my mind: How could I love a race of people who hated me and who had been responsible for breaking me up with one of my best

childhood friends? This was a great question in my mind for a number of years. (King 7)

While it was at Morehouse College that King had what he considers to be his first intellectual encounter with nonviolent resistance, the incident mentioned above leads one to conclude that it was his parents who first presented to him the option of nonviolent living.

Martin Luther King, Jr. was raised by Christian parents who introduced him to the black Christian church experience at a young age. Dr. Cone suggests it was “the faith of the black experience” that had the greatest impact on King’s thinking (Cone 122). The theology stemming from the black Christian church experience is said to be one that denies that the God of Moses and the Children of Israel overlooked the oppression American blacks were subjected to by white Americans (Cone 122). Black Christians believed that God wanted all of humanity to live together as brothers and sisters. Cone says that the theology of the black Christian experience concluded that “color and other physical features were secondary to our universal humanity grounded in God’s creation and redeemed in Jesus’ suffering on the cross” (Cone 122). Cone goes on to say that “it was the black faith that emphasized God’s will to make right what white people made wrong, so that the rule of love would be established among all races of people”(Cone 122). Additionally, according to Cone, within the black church tradition it is impossible to identify one’s self as a Christian without making “the establishment of justice for the poor as the heart of the gospel” (Cone 126). Another essential element that impacted King was the belief in the assurance “of divine presence in the midst of trials and

tribulations of life” (Cone 126). These ideas remained critical to King’s worldview from childhood to death (Cone 122).

During King’s years in academia, he encountered other lines of theological thought that also made significant contributions to his view of the world. King informs us that early in his Crozer years, while on his search for “a method to eliminate the world of social evil”, he came across the work of Walter Rauschenbusch (Zepp 31). King read Rauschenbusch’s *Christianity and the Social Crisis*. King also read Rauschenbusch’s *Theology of the Social Gospel*. Rauschenbusch contributed a great deal to King’s thinking. King credited Rauschenbusch for “giving me a theological basis for the social concern which had already grown up in me as a result of earlier experiences” (King 474). Rauschenbusch was an advocate of the Social Gospel, which King also advocated (Zepp 32). King further expresses his thoughts on Rauschenbusch in saying:

Rauschenbusch had done a great service for the Christian Church by insisting that the gospel deals with the whole man, not only his soul but his body; not only his spiritual well-being but his material well-being. It has been my conviction ever since reading Rauschenbusch that any religion which professes to be concerned about the souls of men and is not concerned about the social and economic conditions that scar the soul is a spiritually moribund religion only waiting for the day to be buried. (Zepp 32)

Furthermore, the dominant concern of Rauschenbusch’s theological thought was “How does the biblical message relate to the social structure of the human community?” (Zepp 32). Rauschenbusch’s claims that “ the social gospel registers the fact that for the

first time in history the spirit of Christianity has had a chance to form a working partnership with real social and psychological sciences”(Zepp 33).

There are many aspects of Rauschenbusch’s thought that King embraced. One aspect is the belief that God is involved in human history. King states:

He is not outside the world looking on with a sort of cold indifference. Here in all the roads of life, he is striving in our striving. Like an ever-loving Father he is working through history for the salvation of his children. As we struggle to defeat the forces of evil, the God of the universe struggles with us. (King 512)

King also shared Rauschenbusch’s conviction that the Church has an important role to play in society. King believed that the church should not be the “master or servant of the state”, “but rather the conscience of the state. It must be the guide and the critic of the state, and never its tool” (Zepp 55). As with Rauschenbusch, it was important for King that the Church be concerned with both soul and body. These men held the belief that:

Christianity is a two-way road. On the one side, it seeks to change the souls of men and thereby unite them with God; on the other, it seeks to change the environmental conditions of men so that the soul will have a chance after it is changed. (Zepp 58)

Rauschenbusch & King were persuaded that the church could help bring about the needed environmental changes, by advocating for structural changes in society.

King says:

One day the whole Jericho Road must be transformed so that men and women will not be beaten and robbed as they make their journey through

life. True compassion is more than flinging a coin at a beggar; it understands that an edifice which produces beggars needs restructuring.

(Zepp 61)

They believed that the church is a critical component to this needed restructuring. That is why they insisted that the church must concern itself with the “unity of soul and body, and the unity of the individual and society”(Zepp 68) .

Another theologian who had a noteworthy impact on King’s thinking was Reinhold Niebuhr. King thought Niebuhr’s most significant contribution to be:

That he refuted the false optimism characteristic of a great segment of Protestant liberalism, without falling into the anti-rationalism of the continental theologian Karl Barth, or the semi-fundamentalism of other dialectical theologians. (Zepp 135)

Niebuhr influenced King’s thought primarily as it relates to his view on human nature.

Kings states:

These elements on Niebuhr’s thinking helped me to recognize that the illusions of superficial optimism concerning human nature and the dangers of a false idealism. While I still believed in man’s potential for good, Niebuhr made me realize his potential for evil as well. Moreover, Niebuhr helped me to recognize the complexity of man’s social involvement and the glaring reality of collective evil. (Zepp 136)

King admits that Niebuhr enlightens his understanding of “reason”:

I also came to see that the superficial optimism of liberalism concerning human nature overlooked the fact that reason is darkened by sin. The

more I thought about human nature the more I saw how tragic inclination for sin encourages us to rationalize our actions. Liberalism failed to show that reason by itself is little more than an instrument to justify men's defensive ways of thinking. Reason, devoid of the purifying power of faith, can never free itself from distortions and rationalization (Zepp 139)

King critiques Niebuhr in saying:

Niebuhr had overemphasized the corruption of human nature. His pessimism concerning human nature was not balanced by the optimism concerning divine nature. He was so involved in diagnosing man's sickness of sin that he overlooked that the cure of grace. (Zepp 136)

The encounters King had with Niebuhr's work allow him to see that the pacifist approach was not one that was free of sin in its attempt to bring about social change. Niebuhr helped King to draw the conclusion that the pacifist stance is the lesser evil (King 87).

The next component of King's academic training that informed his nonviolence philosophy was personalistic philosophy. Regarding personalism King states:

I studied philosophy and theology at Boston University under Edgar S. Brightman and L. Harold DeWolf. . .It was mainly under these teachers that I studied personalistic philosophy—the theory that the clue to the meaning of ultimate reality is found in personality. This personal idealism remains today my basic philosophical position. Personalism's insistence that only—personality finite and infinite—is ultimately real strengthened me in two convictions: it gave me metaphysical and philosophical

grounding for the idea of a personal God, and it gave me a metaphysical basis for the dignity and worth of all human personality. (Zepp 173)

King credits Brightman for contributing the most to his beliefs concerning personalism (Zepp 174). Brightman was known to advocate “for the nonsensible”(Zepp 178).

Brightman said that, “the visible (and all the sensible) consists of the experience patterns within consciousness. In this sense, the visible itself is invisible to any external observer; only I can see and feel exactly what I do see and feel” (Zepp 178). Brightman goes on to say, “personalism is a philosophy whose interpreters seek for a unity that includes all the facts-the facts of value and personality as well as the facts of the sense order” (Zepp 179). The belief of the personalist is, “that conscious personality is both the supreme value and the supreme reality in the universe” (Zepp 182). The Personalist judges that “persons and selves are the only reality, that is, the whole universe is a system or society of interacting selves and persons-one infinite person who is the creator, and many dependent created persons”. The personalist conception of God, the infinite person is that, “God is a spirit, a being whose *esse* is to be conscious, to experience, to think, to will, to love, and to control the ongoing of the universe by rational purpose” (Zepp 185). This conception of God is further explained in saying:

Laying aside, then all thought of corporeal form and limitation as being no factor of personality, we must really say that complete and perfect personality can be found only in the Infinite and Absolute Being, as only in Him can we find the complete and perfect selfhood and self-possession which are necessary to the fullness of personality. In thinking then, of the Supreme Person we must beware of transferring to him the limitations and

accidents of our human personality, which are no necessary part of the notion of personality, and think only of the fullness of power, knowledge, and selfhood which alone are the essential factors of the conception. (Zepp185).

For King, personalism affirms the inherent worth of humans because they are created in the image of God, and are loved by God (Zepp 194). The following statement by personalist Rudolf Lotze helps to explain the concept of humans being in the image of God: “ ‘Perfect personality is in God only’ and all finite minds are ‘but a pale copy thereof’”(Zepp 182). In King’s thought, personalism provides support that all human life is valuable and connected. King says: “when we truly believe in the sacredness of human personality, we won’t exploit people, we won’t trample over people with the iron feet of oppression, we won’t kill anybody” (Zepp 196). King also declares that “the worth of an individual does not lie in the measure of his intellect, his racial origin, or his social position. An individual has value because he has value to God” (Burrow, Jr. 222). King believed that when people are the victims of injustice it is destroying the image of God in both the receiver and inflictor of injustice (Zepp 195). Burrow suggests that to King “to treat even a single person unjustly, therefore, is an affront to all persons, including the Supreme Person”(Burrow, Jr. 226). Personalism provided King the grounds needed to argue that there is a moral law, and within the framework of the moral law there are both just and unjust laws (Burrow, Jr. 213). As well, personalism promotes King’s conviction that God is actively involved in the world (Burrow, Jr. 218). King expresses this belief in saying:

There is something unfolding in the universe whether one speaks of it as some unmoved mover, or whether someone speaks of it as a personal God. There is something in the universe that unfolds for justice and so in Montgomery we felt somehow that as we struggled we had cosmic companionship. (Zepp 199)

Brightman taught that there were three principles of personalism. Those principles are, “respect for personality”, “nature is a revelation of Divine Personality”, and “spiritual liberty”. Zepp’s summary statement concerning the principles is:

The deep appreciation for nature bespeaks the openness and inclusiveness of personalism. It serves to unify science and religion, harmonize nature and revelation in theology as well as the rational and romantic in philosophy, and reconcile differences among the world’s major religions.(Zepp 184)

In the mind of a personalist such as King, “the purpose of life is that persons live together adequately and cooperatively”(Zepp 186). This is so because “ for personalism there is a logical relationship between the personal and the social” because “man naturally expresses himself in terms of community and naturally needs fellowship with others. . . this interaction effects each of us. . .we develop and grow as persons interacting with others in social relationships”(Zepp 190-191). Zepp argues that the aim of personalism is a “world of values”(Zepp 191). This “world of values” is a place where there is “human unity-a unity that does not preclude nor repress differences of opinion or of cultures”, is attainable only if there exists a respect for human personality (Zepp 192). According to Burrow one of the essential elements of personhood for King is

having the freedom to choose to do good or evil. He was persuaded that without this freedom, “there is no person” (Burrow, Jr. 224). Following this fundamental notion is the, the standpoint that “just as the individual owes duties to the community, so does the community owe the individual”, and it is claimed that, “King generally concluded that the individual, not the community has the right of way” (Burrow, Jr. 226). The premises that King draws from personalism are “meliorism, inclusiveness, cooperation, unity, and the value of personality,” these are said to supply the philosophical foundation for the beloved community (Zepp #).

Resulting from such a perspective on the world of persons, Cone suggests that there are three major points of emphasis in King’s thinking throughout his time as a civil rights leader. Those three points are justice, love, and hope. Cone also states that each of the points must be understood considering the crucifixion of Jesus. Furthermore, in December 1955, at the start of the Montgomery bus boycott, the notion of justice was the dominating theme of King’s thinking. Much of King’s speaking is said to be focused on affirming the people in their fight for justice (Cone 61,62). Cone quotes King in saying:

I want to tell you this evening that it is not enough to talk about love. Love is one of the principle parts of the Christian faith. There is another side called justice...Justice is love correcting that which would work against love. The Almighty God. . .is not . . .just standing out saying, “Behold thee, I love you Negro.” He’s also the God that standeth before the nations and says: “Be still and know that I am God, that if you don’t obey me I’m gonna break the backbone of your power. . .”Standing beside love is always

justice. And we are only using the tools of justice. Not only are we using the tools of persuasion but we've got to use the tools of coercion. (Cone 62-63)

Cone contends that such a statement suggests that at this time, the idea of love was secondary to the idea of justice.

The concept of love comes to the forefront of King's thinking around January 27, 1956 after receiving a death threat via the phone. This experience led him to engage in an intimate prayer experience that would forever change his life. From this prayer experience forward, King was forever committed to nonviolence as a way of life (Cone 124-125). King's sense of love was the agape sense of love. Agape was a central component of his nonviolence philosophy (Cone 130). King states:

We say in the nonviolent movement that you've got to love this white man. And God knows he needs our love. . . And let me say to you that I'm not talking about emotional bosh when I talk about love. (Cone 130)

The agape expression of love is made popular in the teachings of Jesus during the Common Era. King and many nonviolence scholars believe that nonviolence is seen in an accurate understanding of agape. Agape is typically defined as a type of love that is unmotivated and spontaneous, love that is creative and indifferent of value (Nygren 75,77, 78). Agape is not predicated upon "affection, sentiment, or emotional depth, nor on the romantic tugs and pulls of our personal lives" (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 40). According to theologian Anders Nygren in order to appropriately understand agape as taught by Jesus one must first examine it in the context of the Christian approach to how one is

able to have fellowship with God. Through agape Jesus is presenting a new understanding concerning fellowship with God. In Matthew Chapter 5, Jesus says:

Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also...Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.(Matthew 38-45)

Nygren suggest that Jesus is commanding his followers to operate in this manner, because this is the type of love that God has extended towards man who is evil as a result of sin, and is therefore undeserving of God's love. In spite of the fact that man does not deserve His love, God loves man anyway, because it is God's nature to love (Nygren 66). These verses help to demonstrate why agape is unmotivated and spontaneous. Agape is not controlled by the worth of its object, which means divine love has no motive outside itself. It is motivated "only by its own intrinsic nature"(Nygren 76).

Agape is seen as unconcerned with the value of the object because it is not until thinking in regards to worthiness of the object is forsaken that one can understand what is meant by agape (Nygren 77). Agape is not a love that recognizes value in something, but it is a love that creates value (Nygren 78). In other words, God does not

love humanity because humans are in and of themselves valuable; humanity has value because God has agape for humanity. Nygren further clarifies this by stating:

If such a thing as fellowship between God and man nevertheless exists, this can only be due to God's own action; God must Himself come to meet man and offer him His fellowship. There is thus no way for man to come to God, but only a way for God to come to man: the way of Divine forgiveness, Divine love. (Nygren 80)

Nygren proposes that the most significant component that stems from the creative nature of Agape is forgiveness. The forgiveness of sin is a creative work, it is God giving a gift to man through Christ (Nygren 80). Based on 2Corinthians 5:19, Gustav Aulen explains the crucifixion of Jesus in the following way:

In Christ, God the offended and violated one, the hurt party, the one snubbed by us, takes the initiative and comes to us with an accepting and loving embrace, and in so doing absorbs and destroys all our guilt, self-pity, pride, separation, and self-elevation while not destroying the agape God has for us. That is the miracle and mystery of agape (Collyer & Zepp Jr. 39).

This understanding of the death of Christ is known as the dramatic or classical theory. This theory allows one to conclude that "the cross of Christ was God's nonviolent action against all the forces of evil and injustice – sin, death, and the devil- or any opposition to God's will and purpose" (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 39). Because Jesus endured the cross, God's anger or wrath has been satisfied, thus reconciliation has occurred between God

and humanity. As it relates to nonviolence the most important distinction between the classical theory and other theories on the cross of Christ is that the classical theory claims it was never God's intent to satisfy his anger by allowing humanity to experience the wrath of God that was experienced by Jesus. It was always God's plan to sacrifice himself by way of Jesus (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 40). Understanding the suffering of Jesus in this manner contends that God's agape is self-giving, it is self-sufficient (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 40).

Now that an understanding of God's agape towards man has been put forth, what must be further explained is the love God commands man to have for Him and his neighbor as taught by Jesus. Nygren argues that for Christian love to be authentically agape it must pattern God's agape towards man. In order for a person to have an agape love for God, the human must be possessed by God. Thus, because God's agape has allowed and drawn man into fellowship with Him, God's love makes the human a slave to God. A slave in the sense that everything the Christian is and has belongs to God. Responding to God's agape by freely surrendering one's heart to God makes the love a person has towards God a spontaneous occurrence and therefore agape (Nygren 94). Nygren further demonstrates that agape nature of a Christian love for God by stating:

When God gives His love freely and for nothing, there remains nothing for man to gain by loving God... It flows by inescapable necessity from the fact of his belonging unreservedly to God; and being aware of so belonging, it devotes its whole attention to the carrying out of God's will. It is obedience to God, without thought of reward (Nygren 94,95).

The Christian command of neighborly love (which includes an enemy) is also birthed from God's agape. This is an important distinction between the Christian command for love of one's neighbor and any other call for neighborly love. The Christian love for one's neighbor is to be unmotivated and spontaneous (Nygren 97). It is a love that possesses "creative power to establish a new fellowship between men" (Nygren 96). Many nonviolent thinkers suggest that forgiveness within the context of agape is an expression of the creative power of agape love; forgiveness is the catalyst to human relationships being reconciled (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 42). Theologian Miroslav Volf's explains forgiveness as follows:

Forgiveness is the boundary between exclusion and embrace. It heals the wounds that power-acts of exclusion have inflicted and breaks down the dividing wall of hostility. Yet it leaves a distance between people, an empty space of neutrality, that allows them either to go their separate ways in what is sometimes called 'peace' or to fall into each other's arms and restore broken communion...At the heart of the cross is Christ's stance of not letting the other remain an enemy and creating space in himself for the offender to come in (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 44)

Christian love is not supposed to be a reflection of the attitude of the individual who is its target, but instead a reflection of God's agape, it is reliant upon fellowship with God (Nygren 96-97). One must first have love for God before they can have agape for their neighbor (Nygren 98). Christians are to love their neighbor simply because God has commanded them to do so, it has nothing to do with the neighbor in and of them self (Nygren 99).

Throughout the teachings of Jesus, nonviolence is believed to be seen and intertwined with his understanding of agape. Therefore, the last statement of Jesus that I will explore that is believed to be a proclamation of nonviolence is the statement “resist not evil” recorded in Matthew chapter 5 and verse 39. New Testament scholar Walter Wink argues that three potential responses can be the consequence of the statement “resist not evil”. That is, Jesus is either implying that one can submit to evil, respond violently to evil, or choose to combat evil with what is typically labeled as nonviolent direct action (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 42). Winks is persuaded that understanding this statement to mean “submit” or “respond violently” to evil would not be consistent with the rest of the teachings and actions of Jesus. Thus it is more accurate to understand Jesus to be advocating for nonviolent resistance to evil (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 43).

It was true for King that one was to love fellow humans simply because God loves them. Cone explains how King now understood the relationship between justice and love as such: “As God’s justice is grounded in God’s creative and redeeming love, so human justice is grounded in love. Neighborly love, especially for the enemy, defines the means by which justice is established and also the goal of the freedom struggle” (Cone 126). Consequently, King’s personal devotion to nonviolence was a result “of his faith in a loving and just God who created us for each other and for eternity”(Cone 128).

In King’s theological thought, the cross of Jesus represented the extent to which God would go to restore broken communities: “The resurrection is a symbol of God’s triumph over all the forces that seek to block community. The Holy Spirit is the continuing community creating reality that moves through history” (Zepp 226). King proclaimed, “What is the cross?. . .but God’s way of saying to a wayward child, ‘I still

love you. . .and. . .if you will see within the suffering Christ on the cross my power, you will be able to be transformed, you will be redeemed’?”(Cone 127). Zepp explains King’s thinking concerning the Cross as follows:

The Cross of Christ is a ‘telescope’ through which we view love, the ‘most durable power in the world,’ and King concludes that “at bottom (it is) the heartbeat of the moral cosmos.” This love, which is the moral law of the universe, or the law of God, radically affirms the value of human personality.(Zepp 198)

King also believed that the cross represented the suffering that those who are impacted by the cross must endure. King believed, “Jesus Christ gave his life for the redemption of this world, and as his followers, we are called to give our lives continuing the reconciling work of Christ in this world” (Cone 127). King’s conviction concerning the cross was the foundation of his total commitment to nonviolence. King did not believe that one could co-labor with God to create the beloved community and operate in a violent manner (Cone 128).

As a result, nonviolence was a critical aspect of King’s philosophy for bringing about social change (Cone 77). To King, nonviolence was not a “do nothing” approach, but an approach that was about direct action, intended to impact the consciousness, an approach believed to weaken the moral and expose the defenses of the opponent. While King did believe that, practically, nonviolent direct action was the only effective way to achieve the goal, it was the moral power of nonviolence that he most appreciated (Cone 77). It was the moral power that led him to recommend nonviolence

as a way of life and not simply as a social justice tactic. King described the power of nonviolence as such:

Now I can assure you that if we rose up in violence in the South our opponents would really know what to do, because they know how to operate on this level. They control all the forces of violence. If he beats you, you develop the power to accept it without retaliating. If he doesn't beat you, fine. If he throws you in jail in the process, you go on in there and you transform the jail from a dungeon of shame to a haven of freedom and human dignity. Even if he kills you, you develop the quiet courage of dying if necessary without killing.(Cone 77)

Behaving in this manner was thought to leave the oppressor as confounded and frustrated (Cone 77). King was persuaded that "The refusal to hit back will cause the oppressors to become ashamed of their own methods and he will be able to transform enemies into friends" (Cone 78). Richard Gregg in his book "The Power of Nonviolence" labeled the process that nonviolence causes the oppressor to engage in as "Moral Jui-Jitsu". Gregg says, "The aim is to convert the opponent, to change his understanding and his sense of values so that he will join wholeheartedly with the resister in seeking a settlement truly amicable and truly satisfying to both sides" (Zepp 103).

King also insisted on the need for nonviolent protestors to have a nonviolent mentality in addition to their nonviolent physical actions. He implored the black community of Montgomery to not have a "we won, you lost" type attitude when they returned to the buses. King proclaimed, "that would only result in transferring those now

on the bottom to the top. But, if we can live up to nonviolence in thought and deed, there will emerge an interracial society based on freedom for all” (Zepp 229). He instructed the people that, “instead of accepting the division of mankind, it is our duty to act in the manner best designed to establish man’s oneness, If we go back in this spirit, our mental attitude will be one that must in the long run bring about reconciliation”(Zepp 228).

King believed there to be a double working of nonviolent action. Even if nonviolence did not instantly bring about the desired result in the opponent, he believed it was still accomplishing something in “the hearts and souls of those committed to it” (Cone 78). To the one operating nonviolently, nonviolence was allowing them to develop “a new self respect”. It calls on resources of strength and courage that they did not know they had” (Cone 78). He saw nonviolence as something that “helps you to work for something that is morally right, namely integration and the brotherhood of men, with methods that are morally right” (Cone 78). Concerning violence, King said that “it destroys community and makes brotherhood impossible. It leaves society in a monologue rather than a dialogue, violence ends by defeating itself. It creates bitterness in the survivors and brutality in the destroyers ”(Zepp 228). In the last days of his life on earth, King said:

I’m just not going to kill anybody, whether it’s in Vietnam or here. I’m not going to burn down any building. If nonviolent protest fails this summer, I will continue to preach it and teach it, and we at the SCLC will still do this. I plan to stand by nonviolence because I have found it to be a philosophy of life that regulated not only my dealings in the struggle for racial justice

but also for my dealing with people, with my own self. I will be faithful to nonviolence. (Zepp 126)

For Martin Luther King Jr. operating nonviolently was the only means by which the beloved community can be achieved. It was in the last years of King's life that the theme of "Hope" became the central idea in his thinking, and this hope was pertaining to the realization of the beloved Community.

The creation of the Beloved Community was King's chief objective as a minister and a civil rights leader. King saw the many nonviolent campaigns that he led as a means to achieve the end goal of the Beloved Community (Zepp 207). King says, "We are striving for the removal of all barriers that divide and alienate mankind, whether racial, economic, or psychological" (Zepp 207). The desire for an inclusive human community is also seen in the writings of Rauschenbusch, Niebuhr, and in the philosophy of personalism; it is often called the Kingdom of God. Zepp summarizes some of the major influences on King's thought in saying:

The social gospel provides a theological framework in which to articulate it. Nonviolence provides the means by which to establish it. Personalism provides the philosophical bases for supporting the personal nature of the community. And Niebuhr's realism serves to qualify King's optimism about its possible realization in history. (Zepp 207)

I believe if Cone could add to Zepp's summary, he would further state that it was the theology that King encountered in the black Christian experience that motivated him to keep striving to achieve the Beloved Community.

In the thinking of Martin Luther King, Jr. the beloved community is a place where all people live together as brothers and sisters working together for the good of everyone (Cone 69). When the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) was established, King stated, The ultimate aim of SCLC is to foster and create the beloved community in America where brotherhood is a reality. . .SCLC works for the integration. Our ultimate goal is genuine intergroup and interpersonal living-integration”(Zepp211). Integration to King was a “positive acceptance of desegregation and the welcomed participation of Negroes into the total range of human activity . . .”(Zepp 211) King saw desegregation, the removal of “legal prohibitions”, as the first step to achieving full integration (i.e. the Beloved Community or the American Dream)(Cone 64,130,235; Zepp 211).King noted that:

In every city, we have a dual society . . ., two economies,. . .two housing markets,. . .two school systems. This duality has brought about a great deal of injustice . . . To deal with this unjust dualism we must constantly work toward the goal of a truly integrated society while at the same time we enrich the ghetto. We must seek to enrich the ghetto immediately in the sense of improving the housing conditions, improving schools . . ., improving the economic conditions . . .(Cone 235)

King declared: “You can’t legislate integration, but you can legislate desegregation”. To King, the schools and churches had to move society forward in achieving full integration (Cone 69). In his view justice called for desegregation but agape demanded full integration. King explains:

Desegregation gives us a society where men are physically desegregated and spiritually segregated, where elbows are together and hearts are apart. It gives us special togetherness and spiritual apartness. It leaves us with a stagnant equality of sameness rather than a constructive equality of oneness. (Zepp 212)

A fully integrated society is one where all are treated equally, where human loyalty “transcends our race, tribe, class and nation” because “all human life is connected” (Zepp 208-209). King believed that:

In a real sense, all life is interrelated. The agony of the poor impoverished the rich; the betterment of the poor enriches the rich. We are inevitably our brother’s keeper because we are our brother’s brother. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly. (Zepp 210)

King also communicated this by saying:

Let us be dissatisfied until rat-infested, vermin-filled slums will be a thing of a dark past and every family will have decent sanitary houses. . .until the empty stomachs of Mississippi are filled and idle industries in Appalachia are revitalized. . .until our brothers of the Third World-Asia, Africa, and Latin America-will no longer be the victim of imperialist exploitation, but will be lifted from. . . poverty, illiteracy, and disease.(Zepp 213)

The beloved community is to be a place where citizens are operating under the influence of the agape sense of love because is thought to be “mankind’s most potent

weapon for personal and social transformation” (Zepp 230). There is a need to be motivated by agape because hate is destructive, and King was convinced that “creation is so designed that my personality can only be fulfilled in the context of community”(Zepp 225). Agape empowers people to operate with “wise restraint and calm reasonableness”(Zepp 230) It is a community where there is “understanding, redeeming good will for all men”(Zepp 225). King preached that, “While abhorring segregation, we shall love the segregationist. This is the only way to create the beloved community” (Zepp 230).

While it is true that a large part of King’s motivation for nonviolent living is based on his religious beliefs, he did not believe that one had to share his beliefs to engage in nonviolent living (Cone 128). As stated earlier, King’s nonviolence philosophy was also influenced by Gandhi. It was Gandhi who helped King expand his understanding concerning the usefulness of nonviolence. In King’s autobiography he confesses:

As I delved deeper into the philosophy of Gandhi, my skepticism concerning the power of love gradually diminished, and I came to see for the first time its potency in the area of social reform. Prior to reading Gandhi, I had about concluded that the ethics of Jesus were only effective in individual relationships. The ‘turn the other cheek’ and ‘the love your enemies’ philosophy were only valid, I felt, when individuals were in conflict with other individuals; when racial groups and nations were in conflict a more realistic approach seemed necessary. But after reading Gandhi, I saw how utterly mistaken I was. (King 23-24)

King has also been quoted as saying, “Christ furnished the spirit and motivation, while Gandhi furnished the method” (Cone 77). While Gandhi was not a follower of Christ in the traditional sense, the teachings of Christ also informed his conception of nonviolence. He was particularly fond of the sermon given by Jesus normally labeled as the Sermon on the Mount and nonviolence advocate Leo Tolstoy’s book *The Kingdom of God is Within You* (Ackrman & DuVall 65) Gandhi believed that the central teaching of the Bible was nonviolence. He is noted as saying:

I have an implicit faith - faith that today burns brighter than even half a century’s experience of unbroken practice of nonviolence – that mankind can only be saved through nonviolence which is the central teaching of the Bible as I understand the Bible. (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 64)

Nevertheless, Gandhi’s foundational understanding of nonviolence was derived from ahimsa, as he was a devout Hindu (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 56-57). Gandhi’s definition of ahimsa, however, goes beyond that which is found in traditional Hinduism. Some argue that this is due to him being influenced by the teachings of Jesus (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 64; Nojeim 99). Gandhi uniquely defined ahimsa as love and viewed it as the most powerful force in the world (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 64). To Gandhi ahimsa was the law of love, it was love in action, and it was just as reliable as the law of gravitation (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 63). It was his conviction that not only should the nonviolent practitioner love his perceived enemy, but he should “not even show anger toward an unjust opponent” (Nojeim 99).

Nonviolence should be reflected in both thoughts and actions towards everything. Another essential component of nonviolence for Gandhi is the willingness to suffer injury to your own body for the sake of nonviolent resistance. The aim of self-sacrifice was to weaken the persons choosing to operate violently. Weakening them in the sense that their hearts will be softened and in the end they will be forced to no longer operate violently (Nojeim 100). Gandhi expressed his view on self-sacrifice as follows:

The votary of ahimsa has to cultivate the capacity for sacrifice of the highest type in order to be free from fear. . .He who has not overcome fear cannot practice ahimsa to perfection. . .He who trembles or takes to his heels the moment he sees two people fighting is not nonviolent, but a coward. A nonviolent person will lay down his life in preventing such quarrels. The bravery of the nonviolent is vastly superior to that of the violent. (Nojeim 100)

Furthermore, Gandhi believed that the means to an end was more important than the end itself. As a result of this in his social justice endeavors, nonviolence was the only option. His primary concern was not to achieve the political objective, but achieving a greater degree of ahimsa within himself and others (Nojeim 100). Gandhi believed that choosing nonviolence just for pragmatic purposes was a form of nonviolence that was practiced by the weak and fearful (Nojeim 101). He felt that this type of embrace of nonviolence allowed for them to still have violence in their spirit (Nojeim 101). Gandhi speaks to this in saying:

Nonviolence for me is not a mere experiment. It is part of my life and the whole creed of satyagraha, noncooperation, and civil disobedience and the like are necessary deductions from the fundamental proposition that nonviolence is the law of life for human beings. (Nojeim 101)

As Gandhi stated, his conviction to use pure means was central in the development of his satyagraha philosophy. Satyagraha means truth force or soul force. Above all things knowing truth was most important to Gandhi, and his belief was that God is truth. He wanted to know God face-to-face (Nojeim 92). While Gandhi did believe that there was such a thing as absolute truth, he did not believe it was possible for any human to know truth in its entirety. If someone does know truth in its entirety then they would be perfect. His thinking was: I cannot know absolute truth and therefore I must operate nonviolently and remain open to other perspectives because it is possible that my opponent has at least some measure of truth. He felt that because we will always be ignorant of truth to some degree we are unqualified to impose punishment on others, and we must therefore be motivated by ahimsa (Nojeim 92, 94). In conflict, the aim of the satyagrahi, a follower of this belief, is not “to defeat adversaries, but rather to win them over through a loving, yet firm and uncompromising way.” The satyagrahi is also open to being won over if it is shown to them that their opponent’s viewpoint is more truthful than their own (Nojeim 94,106).

Gandhi’s satyagraha philosophy has a very strict adherence to ahimsa, to such a degree that being driven by ill will is seen as violence. Ill will worsens the conflict and prevents healing. Gandhi communicates that:

A satyagrahi does not take advantage of an opponent's weakness; rather, he or she hopes to convert the heart and soul of the opponent by virtue of adhering to the truth, enduring self-suffering, remaining sincere and chivalrous and by avoiding hurting, humbling, or embittering the opponent. (Nojeim 96)

The satyagrahi desires that all involved be uplifted and drawn together in a deeper sense of community (Nojeim 95). It was crucial to Gandhi that his satyagraha philosophy be comprehended as more than a method of resistance for social justice initiatives (Nojeim 94). Gandhi made it known that his main focus in fighting for the independence of India was more about the internal state of the people of India than about the British (Nojeim 102). In Gandhi's mind true independence or freedom rested on people having self-control (Nojeim 103). Michael Nojeim expresses Gandhi's view of independence and freedom as such:

Whereas the West's ideas of freedom meant the absence of restraints on individual pursuits and an exclusivist notion of individual behavior, Gandhi's notion was of an inclusive universalism that acted affirmatively in uniting the individual with the society (Nojeim 103).

Nojeim informs readers that Gandhi was persuaded that truth, nonviolence, political freedom, and economic freedom constituted independence (Nojeim 103). Nojeim goes on to state that:

Until his death Gandhi argued that independence would be meaningless for India unless people could achieve truth, nonviolence, political freedom,

and economic freedom. Gandhi's point was that Indians had to gain sovereignty over themselves and how they behaved in their own lives before they gained real sovereignty over their country (Nojeim 103).

Living with a satyagraha worldview led Gandhi to live a life dedicated to serving others and demonstrating for them the power of nonviolence. He lived with the mindset of "desirelessness," meaning he aimed to rid himself of earthly desires. This included desires pertaining to eating habits, material possessions, and sexual activity. He took this stance because he "believed that if people could not conquer their desires, then that would lead to an irresistible temptation to use whatever means were necessary to achieve their desires, which in turn leads to violence" (Nojeim 108). The result of Gandhi's pursuit of desirelessness was that:

His concern with self became almost nonexistent. Gandhi relinquished concern for himself, there was an almost total unawareness of self in his actions and words. The more Gandhi mastered his senses, the less self-centered he became, which enabled him to devote his energies to serving others. (Nojeim 110)

Gandhi's philosophy for serving others involved encouragement and welfare for all; he called this sarvodaya. Sarvodaya values drove him to no longer esteem his biological family as special when compared to others. Gandhi grew into a strong sense of inclusiveness that was seemingly interpreted by his kin as neglect, because he wanted to be of service to individuals he thought needed his help more than his kin did (Nojeim 111). He spent years pleading for Hindu and Muslim unity. A lifelong goal of Gandhi's

was ending the caste system and “untouchability”. It is said that Gandhi interpreted untouchability as a system that brought about division and exclusivity, and he was one who promoted and worked towards unity and inclusivity (Nojeim 116). Gandhi was also an activist for the empowerment of women. In 1918 Gandhi is noted as saying “Many of our movements stop half way because of the condition of our women” (Nojeim 118). His attitudes towards women’s rights are expressed further in saying:

Gandhi lamented the fact that even ignorant and worthless men enjoyed positions of superiority over women they surely did not deserve. He argued that women have the same mental capacities as men and therefore should have the same rights to participate in all men’s activities, enjoying the same rights, freedoms, and liberties as men. He said that if women were to be treated as equals to men, then the attitudes of both men and women must change (Nojeim 119)

Gandhi dedicated his life to fighting for inclusion, and just as Martin Luther King, Jr. he too believed nonviolence was the only way to obtain an inclusive human community.

Once it is understood that the ultimate goal of both King and Gandhi was the creation of diverse and inclusive communities, and that in their opinions the only way to achieve this is through nonviolence, the question now becomes how do we equip the citizens of the world with the skills they need to live nonviolently? In my opinion, the best way to do this is through what is known as the *Kingian Nonviolence Training and Educational Program*. *Kingian Nonviolence* is based on the nonviolence philosophy of

Martin Luther King, Jr. This approach to nonviolence training and education was developed by Dr. Bernard LaFayette (a member of Dr. King's executive staff) in partnership with David C. Jehnsen and Charles L. Alphin, Sr. (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 121). Dr. LaFayette and Dr. Jehnsen developed the educational program based on their experiences working with Dr. King during the Civil Rights Movement. The Kingian Nonviolence Training and Educational Program:

is designed to provide a general introduction to the skills and information of Kingian Nonviolence Conflict Reconciliation and the basic foundation for understanding issues and problems facing individuals, groups, and communities. The program and associated activities explore concepts, theories, strategies and techniques of the nonviolent methodology. It is a training and educational course in that it is designed to teach skills and provide a philosophical, cognitive experience. (LaFayette & Jehnsen 5)

The program explores the “historical context and legacy”, the “philosophical and strategic foundation” and “nonviolence organization and mobilization” (LaFayette & Jehnsen 6). The program consists of three phases: the “Introductory Seminar”, the “Practicum and Continuation Seminar”, and the “Advanced Course leaders Training Program”. The Introductory Seminar also known as the “Two-day Core” is recommended for introducing nonviolence. In the Two-day Core sessions several concepts are introduced. It starts with the introduction of those involved in the training experience. The approach used for the introductions is one that is intended to allow participants to engage in perspective taking, which is a skill needed for nonviolent living. The next part of the curriculum deals with skills needed for finding “positive common

ground”(Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 122). This segment of the training is to highlight the point that all humans are capable of both good and evil and in times of anger we must be able to utilize the skill of remembering the humanity of our opponent(s), as “anger and hatred create the tendency to dehumanize our opponent(s)” (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 123).

From this point, the curriculum calls for exploring the types and levels of conflict. In Kingian thought there are believed to be four types of conflict: pathway, mutually exclusive, distributive, and value conflict. Pathway conflict involves people that desire to accomplish the same thing, but have different points of view as to how to reach it. Mutually exclusive conflict concerns people who for whatever reason (such as family or job) must work together, but are at odds about what they should be working to achieve. Distributive conflict is when there are insufficient resources, and involved parties are contending for the share. Lastly, value conflict entails basic contentions over morals, what is deemed as acceptable and not acceptable (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 123-124). After the types of conflict have been discussed, the training addresses the three levels of conflict: normal, pervasive, and overt levels of conflict. Conflict is considered normal when things are dealt with according to “accepted rules” (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 124). Pervasive conflict involves, “strong emotions, raised voices, combative or defensive postures, and thoughts and words that dehumanize the opponent (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 124). This level of conflict is perceived to be “setting them up as a target to be attacked rather than a person deserving respect and consideration” (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 124). The overt level of conflict is literal physical fighting. This exploration of conflict is meant to bring the understanding that “conflict can be analyzed, and that the structure of the

conflict may contain helpful clues for a participant in the conflict or for an interested bystander. Collyer states:

Our goal is not to eliminate conflict. Sometimes our goal is to actually create it. As practitioners of nonviolence, we are interested in maintaining constructive efforts at the normal level of conflict, preventing escalation to the other levels and intervening to de-escalate to the normal level when necessary (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 125).

This portion of the training is about nonviolent conflict management, but in order to manage conflict one must first understand it.

As the Two-day Core sessions continue, participants will examine some of the nonviolent campaigns lead by Dr. King. They examine these for the purpose of demonstrating the “successful use of nonviolence training in community change” (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 127). The hope is that the issue(s) dealt with will be understood, that some of the people involved will be known, and that they are aware of the methods used and the results that stemmed from them. Studying the nonviolence campaigns then leads to the principles of nonviolence being introduced and elaborated upon. Kingian Nonviolence scholars suggest King’s nonviolence philosophy could be summed up by six principles: (a) nonviolence is a way of life for courageous people, (b) the beloved community is the goal, (c) attack forces of evil, not persons doing evil, (d) accept suffering without retaliation for the sake of the cause to achieve a goal, (e) avoid internal violence of the spirit as well as external physical violence, and (f) the universe is on the side of justice(Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 130). King communicates these beliefs

concerning nonviolence in his book *Stride towards Freedom*. Regarding the principles Collyer says:

These principles challenge human beings to take the “high road.”

While they are nice words, the principle will not be considered for serious adoption by most people until they have spent some training time on both the reasons for adopting such ideals and the practical difficulties of living up to them. Interestingly, most people recognize that they want to accept these principles but the real world makes it too difficult to do so. (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 130)

Extending from the third principle, “attack forces of evil, not persons doing evil”, the training then moves to looking at aggression and conciliation. This aspect is about providing the skills needed to “direct aggression towards conditions and conciliation towards people” (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 134).

Once the six principles have been taught it is then time to discuss and develop the skills needed to use the six steps for resolving conflict nonviolently. The six steps are: information gathering, education, personal commitment, negotiation, direct action, and reconciliation (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 134). The Two-day core training session ends with activities intended to help participants gain skills that will enable them to engage in top-down/bottom-up problem solving planning. The aim here is to be able to create synthesis between conflicting parties. The second day concludes with Large-Scale Exercises that are designed to test many of the skills that have been introduced through the training (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 142). Collyer summarizes some of the outcomes of the training as follows:

Participants in the nonviolence training are reminded through the values exercise that each person has good values, and that while there are differences between people, there is also positive common ground.

Nonviolence training fills in gaps in people' knowledge about Martin Luther King, Jr., and about the legacy of the civil rights movement, and about the current concerns and functioning of communities, especially in the United States.

The training encourages people to examine their own beliefs and values and practices. It challenges people to consider their life choices and strategies for meeting their needs.

The affirmation of personal worth and the acceptance of needs, combined with the challenge to change strategies, is an honest approach that can appeal to at-risk youth and others who are cynical about attempts to change them as people. The strength of character and courage required to live nonviolently elevates the approach above the myth that "turning the other cheek" is a punk's way out, that anyone who is nonviolent is simply afraid.

Presented as both philosophy and methodology, nonviolence "rings true" to many people in the management and human services roles. It captures

the complexity and textures of everyday work with people by emphasizing the practical value of a positive approach, while not shrinking from the difficulties of dealing with the negative side of human nature.

Training also allows individuals to consider embracing a potential lifestyle change along with a group of people who have shared the experience. New behaviors can be tried out and supported, and people often develop a sense of mission tighter. The training is an opportunity for people to make a commitment to a “higher road”. Many people are surprised to discover that they seem to have been waiting for this opportunity. We have been told that training has energized and given new motivation to people; that it has transformed their way of thinking about others; and that it has given group members a new framework or paradigm for thinking about solving problems and managing conflict.

These anecdotes have been confirmed by research. Dr. Maram Hallk developed measures of the degree to which this type of nonviolence training reliably produces positive change in attitudes and knowledge. Changes are evident both immediately following training and at follow-up several months later.

For Martin Luther King, Jr. “the ultimate goal is integration which is genuine intergroup and interpersonal living” and he believed, “only through nonviolence can this goal be attained, for the aftermath of nonviolence is reconciliation and the creation of the

beloved community” (King 215). Following King’s line of thought, the problem that we face today, as it relates to living in diverse and inclusive communities, is that many people still do not have an accurate understating of nonviolence and have not been taught the skills needed for nonviolent living. Kingian Nonviolence would be effective for educating people concerning the philosophy of nonviolence and helping equip them with the skills needed to create and reside in inclusive communities. *The Kingian Nonviolence Training and Educational Program* is also a self-sustaining approach because it can be institutionalized.

In the book *Getting to Peace*, William Ury informs readers that science has shown that roughly 60,000 years ago all humanity descended from a single minuscule group that began in Africa. As human history progressed people have separated and taken up residence in a variety of places. Resulting from this great separation we now have a world filled with a multiplicity of cultures. Ury goes on to suggest that as a consequence of population growth and advances in travel and communication in our world today, we are experiencing a “great reunion” (Collyer 1). Like never before, the various cultures of the world are being drawn to interact with one another. Many individuals are oblivious to the fact that they are engaged in this great reunion of humanity until they directly encounter it in public settings, such as schools and workplaces. For a number of people it is only in such settings they have daily interactions with people who they might perceive to be very different from them, and they do not always know how to approach these interactions. In many cases, people come to these settings with a number of preconceived ideas about other

people, and the groups they identify with, and this often results in stereotyping. And in these public settings their ideas will be challenged.

King was an integrationist and integrationists believe that “whites would change their views about Negroes when they got to know each other” (Cone 31). The following statement is said to be the core of King’s integrationist philosophy: “Men often hate each other because they fear each other; they fear each other because they don’t know each other; they don’t know each other because they cannot communicate; they cannot communicate because they are separated” (Cone 37). This belief of King and other integrationists is somewhat supported by what social psychologists call the Contact Hypothesis. The Contact Hypothesis is a concept well known to social psychologists as a method for reducing prejudice and discrimination. It is based on the belief that prejudice results from ignorance:

According to this view, people who have very little contact with other groups have no information about them, so they try to fill the gap by forming stereotypes. If people could resolve ignorance by having more interactions and getting more firsthand information about out groups, prejudice would diminish or even disappear (Baumister & Bushman 406).

King’s personal reflection was that, “I did not conquer this anti-white feeling until I entered college and came in contact with white students through working in interracial organizations”(Cone 26). The Contact Hypothesis, however, states that “regular interaction between members of different groups reduces prejudice, providing that it occurs under favorable conditions” (Baumister & Bushman 406). The challenge to the Contact Hypothesis is increasing the circumstances in which it is effective. It has been

shown that simply bringing people of different groups together, on average, does not reduce prejudice, but there must be certain factors that are true regarding the situation.

Those factors are:

1. The out-group members have traits and abilities challenging negative stereotypes
2. The contact is supported by social norms.
3. The groups must be of equal status in the contact setting.
4. The contact needs to occur in personal interactions
5. Groups engage in cooperative activities to achieve a common goal.

It would be useful to test whether or not nonviolence training would help to create new social conditions in which the Contact Hypothesis is shown to be true. Martin Luther King suggested that “the philosophy and strategy of nonviolence becomes immediately a subject for study and for serious experimentation in every field of human conflict, by no means excluding the relation between nations” (King 184). My argument pertaining to the Contact Hypothesis is that if we were to bring people of different groups together, who have completed nonviolence training, then prejudice and discrimination would be reduced, even if the traditional criteria for the Contact Hypothesis are not met. It is also my argument that nonviolence training will reduce prejudice and discrimination at the level of both implicit (unconscious) and explicit (conscious) attitudes. If the nonviolence philosophy of Martin Luther King Jr. was so powerful that it transformed our nation, and thus changed the world, perhaps it has enough power to transform us as individuals and positively impact our communities as a whole.

Therefore, nonviolence training in the context of diversity and inclusion efforts is worthy of experimentation. The potential benefits are priceless.

One of the greatest benefits that could be seen from using nonviolence training for the sake of diversity and inclusion would appear in the grade school social contexts. It is in grade school that many people first encounter bullying and social rejection. Starting in grade school people are said to be perceived as popular, nerds, losers, outcasts, et cetera. These type classifications foster social rejection which to King would be a form of violence, because it scars the personality. These labels do not affirm the value and equal worth of all humanity. It is my opinion that bullying stems out of such classification. Thus, if we began training the children and adults of the world on how to think and respond to those who seem strangely different from them in a nonviolent manner versus labeling and treating them as losers, outcasts and things of this nature, our society may be less likely to have bullying and people who desire to execute shooting massacres because perhaps they do not feel embraced by society and the majority of people they have daily interactions with. Consequently this makes them capable of executing horrific shooting massacres because the individual feels excluded from the community and as a result loses his or her sense of caring for the other.

Nonviolence is about fostering and preserving that which has the power to breed the beloved community. Nonviolence not only provides a bridge that allows for individuals to come together so that they are able to communicate, but nonviolence training also teaches them how to communicate. Nonviolence training would help us work towards eradicating a culture of violence, everything from stereotyping to

bullying. Nonviolence promotes a commitment to creative, peaceful problem-solving, and to the idea that all people are important, valuable, and have something meaningful to contribute (Collyer 5).

In a general sense, the goal of diversity and inclusion efforts is to build diverse and inclusive communities. Nonviolence scholars suggest that when people encounter each other, there are opportunities for conflict, creativity, or creative-conflict (Collyer 1-2). Nonviolence training is designed to motivate people and give them the skills needed to choose creative conflict over violent conflict. Nonviolence training provides them with the skills to help maneuver through interactions with people, particularly people who appear different from them. It teaches them how to approach the conflict nonviolently. It would also cause them to examine ways in which they are connected to the rest of humanity. It typically helps one to realize why one must have greater concern for the other; it helps to point out the commonalities of all humanity. Nonviolence training would help people to understand what King meant when he said:

Through our scientific and technological genius, we have made of this world a neighborhood and yet we have not had the ethical commitment to make of it a brotherhood. But somehow, and in some way, we have got to do this. We must all learn to live together as brothers or we will all perish together as fools. We are tied together in the single garment of destiny, caught in an inescapable network of mutuality. And whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly. For some strange reason I can never be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be. And you can never be what you ought to be until I am what I

ought to be. This is the way God's universe is made; this is the way it is structured. (King #)

In summation, during the era of Martin Luther King, Jr. 's leadership, he demanded nonviolence when participating in marches, protests, and boycotts, and he recommended adopting it as a way of life. King demanded nonviolent direct action because he believed it was the only way to achieve the beloved community. In order to maximize the benefits of nonviolence when seeking to build diverse and inclusive communities, our thinking must expand from simply nonviolent direct action to include nonviolent daily interactions, or in other words, nonviolence as a way of life, in every aspect of life. Nonviolence must become more than a social justice tactic; we must now place greater emphasis on nonviolence in interpersonal relationships. *Kingian Nonviolence Training* can help to give people the skills needed to use nonviolence not only as a social justice tactic, but also in their day-to-day activities.

Imagine a community where children and others no longer have to endure the hardships of stereotyping, bullying and exclusion. A community where domestic violence and violence against women is a thing of the past, a community free of gang and gun violence. A world community where the majority of its political leaders have been trained to think nonviolently, and as a result the lives of many soldiers and war zone citizens are saved, and they are perhaps spared from the experience of Post Traumatic Stress disorder. Permeating nonviolence training throughout society, in a systematic fashion, could help get humanity closer to such an existence. Social psychologists suggest that as global warming worsens, violence will increase. It is reported that:

Most global warming experts predict that temperatures will rise between 2°F and 8°F by the middle of this century. If temperatures rise 2°F, the number of assaults and murders in the United States is predicted to rise by more than 25,000 each year. If temperatures rise by 8°F, the annual predicted rise in assaults and murders is more than 80,000. If you are around 20 years old, by the time you are 50 or 60, the world may be a much more violent place than it is now, if temperatures continue to rise. (Baumeister& Bushman 306)

Given such predictions it is all the more important that we as a society find systematic ways to combat violence in all forms. One way to do this is, at the very least; make sure people are taught the skills needed to function nonviolently. For King, nonviolence was to be a way of life and he encouraged others to practice nonviolence as a way of life. In order for people to seriously choose nonviolence as a way of life, they must first have an accurate understanding of it and have the skills needed to function nonviolently.

Needless to say creating diverse, inclusive and nonviolent environments will be a progressive process, and not everyone will be receptive to a philosophy of nonviolence. Recognizing this reality, a unique aspect to nonviolence is that in teaching one about functioning nonviolently, it prepares one to respond to resistance to nonviolence nonviolently. The success of nonviolence training as a means by which to create diverse and inclusive communities, whether it be local communities or the international community, should not be determined by whether or not our world has been completely eradicated of violence. Nonviolence training can be considered

successful when people have come to develop an accurate understanding of operating nonviolently. When they are well informed that nonviolence is not a “do nothing approach”, when they are able to recognize violence in its many forms, and when they have been equipped with the skills needed to at least consider thinking critically through a nonviolent approach. When it comes to assessing the success of nonviolence training it is worthwhile to remember the words from nonviolence scholar Dr. Charles Collyer:

Often a person will say to me, “Oh, I could never be nonviolent, because I get angry”. . . This person is imagining that being nonviolent is like a conversion to being a different kind of person, and that it requires not being angry. What if the person were saying “Oh, I could never become educated, because sometimes I do stupid things.” We would challenge them by pointing out that everyone does stupid things, even very educated people. Fortunately, especially for me, giving up stupidity is not a precondition for learning .Nonviolence should not be a religious dogma to which we convert after meeting certain conditions. (Collyer 6-7)

Nonviolent living can be learned by all, and as with most things that can be learned, learning to live nonviolently will be a progressive process. The goal is to progressively become more and more nonviolent in our daily interactions, because this would help to create a better environment for all. *Kingian Nonviolence Training* is a practical option that would help to address many of the complex issues of our day that at their root are issues of diversity and inclusion.

If we believe that Martin Luther King, Jr. is truly worthy of all the honor he is given then it is in our best interest to take his advice seriously concerning the usefulness of nonviolence and the need to experiment with it in every area of human conflict. The time is now for our understanding of nonviolence to move beyond nonviolent direct action to include nonviolent daily interactions. Martin Luther King, Jr. is said to have been confident that:

Because the universe is on the side of justice, because love beats in the heart of the moral cosmos, because God is good and just, 'history does not pose problems without eventually producing solutions.' The solution produced in the latter half of the sixth decade of this country was the 'peaceful weapon of nonviolent direct action'. (Zepp 20)

It is my opinion that the solution that history has produced for this decade and decades to come is nonviolent daily interactions, nonviolence as a way of life. The *Kingian Nonviolence Training and Educational Program* is a practical means that will enable us to achieve a world containing diverse and inclusive communities. As King said: "The question now is, do we have the morality and courage required to live together as brothers and not be afraid?" (King 192).

Appendix:

VI. The origins of Nonviolence:

One does not have to study nonviolence long to discover that nonviolence is a multicultural concept. Nonviolent thinking has roots as far back as more than 2000 BCE within the religion of Hinduism which is practiced primarily by the people of India. Hinduism is unique among the religions of the world because there is a multiplicity of beliefs that one can hold and still be considered a Hindu. Diversity is said to be a distinctive element of Hinduism. Scholars have come to the conclusion that in spite of the great diversity that is within the Hindu religion there are some common ideas that are consistent throughout (Partridge 134). Printed in the Vedas, what is known to be the oldest scriptures of the Hindu religion, the word ahimsa is found. Ahimsa is considered to be the highest ethical virtue for the Hindu. Ahimsa refers to non-injury and abstaining from violence in thought and action. Seemingly, this concept of ahimsa is not emphasized until the Hindu reform movement which births the religions of Jainism and Buddhism about sixth/fifth century BCE (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 57).

Ahimsa is the foundation of the ethics of Jainism. It is the rejection of killing and doing harm. At the core, ahimsa calls for a deep-seated vow to abstain from harming any living being. Ahimsa does not allow for causing harm in the forms of killing, misuse, insult, torment, and persecution of any living creation (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 57). In the book *Nonviolence Origins & Outcomes*, Ira Zepp, Jr. reports the following:

During My Fulbright travels to India, especially the holy city of Varanasi, I saw Jain monks carrying brooms to sweep the path before their footsteps and wearing cloth masks over their noses and mouth so they would not, in

either case, inadvertently tramp on, swallow or otherwise destroy insects or even smaller other microorganisms (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 58).

Zepp goes on to inform readers that ahimsa also motivates the Jain believer to not partake in hunting or farming, believing it is an impossibility to plow or till soil without harming the smallest of living things (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 58). In Buddhism ahimsa is not observed to the same degree that it is Jainism. In the Noble Eightfold Path of Buddhism there is a path that deals with “Right Effort” also interpreted as “Right Conduct”. The major principal of this path is: do not kill. The Buddhist understanding of do not kill is inclusive of animals but not to the extent of the Jain believer (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 60). It is also important to be mindful that ahimsa goes beyond the act of physical harm.

Shashtri & Shastri indicate that:

Ahimsa is an antidote to . . . violence. But there is far more to ahimsa than merely non-hurting or non-killing. It includes giving up concepts of “otherness,” “separateness,” “selfishness,” and self-centeredness” and identifying oneself with all other beings (Nojeim 98).

At the same time Hinduism was being reformed, the Greek philosopher and mathematician Pythagoras was constructing a theory of nonviolence (Collyer & Zepp, Jr. 57). Before the Hindu reformers or Pythagoras were driven towards nonviolence there was a Chinese philosopher who is viewed as a nonviolent thinker; he is known today as Mo Zi. While his birth date and death date are unknown, Mo Zi is believed to have lived between 479 BCE (death of Confucius) and 372 BCE (birth of Mencius). He is thought to have lived in this period because he was a critic of Confucianism and Mencius was a

critic of Mo Zi. What is known about Mo Zi is that he had a philosophy of Universal Love. His thinking is that “it is the business of the benevolent man to try to promote what is beneficial to the world and to eliminate what is harmful.” Mo Zi saw those things which brought about harm in his day as:

Great states attacking small ones, great families overthrowing small ones, the strong oppressing the weak, the many harrying the few, the cunning deceiving the stupid, the eminent lording it over the humble... rulers who are not generous, ministers who are not loyal, fathers who are without kindness, and sons who are unfilial, as well as those mean men who, with weapons, knives, poison, fire, and water, seek to injure and undo each other (Watson 41).

Mo Zi argues that when one investigates what causes these harms, they do not stem from loving others and desiring to benefit them, but result from hating others and wanting to injure them. Mo Zi labels this hatred and trying to injure others as partiality and for him partiality is the root of all the great harms in the world, and universality is what makes way for all the great benefits of the world (Watson 41-42). He contends that if the standard of the world is universality:

Those with sharp ears and clear eyes will see and hear for others, those with sturdy limbs will work for others, and those with a knowledge of the way will endeavor to teach others. Those who are old and without wives or children will find means and support and will be able to live out their days;

the young and orphaned who have no parents will find someone to care for them and look after their needs (Watson 43).

In his writing he further compares the partial minded person to the universal-minded person in saying:

The believer in partiality says, 'How could I possibly regard my friend the same as myself, or my friend's father the same as my own?' Because he views his friend in this way, he will not feed him when he is hungry, clothe him when cold, nourish him when sick, or bury him when he dies...But the words and actions of the universal –minded man are not like these. He will say, 'I have heard that the truly superior man of the world regards his friends the same as himself, and his friend's father the same as his own...Because he views his friend in this way, he will feed him when he is hungry, clothe him when he is cold, nourish him when his is sick, and bury him when he dies (Watson 43).

Mo Zi also puts forth that there are contradictions between the words and actions of partial-minded individuals concerning their criticism of universality (Watson 44). He presents the following situation to demonstrate his point:

Suppose that here is a broad plain, a vast wilderness, and a man is buckling on his armor and donning his helmet to set out for the field of battle, where the fortunes of life and death are unknown; or he is setting out in his lords's name upon a distant mission to Ba or Yue, Qi or Jing, and his return is uncertain. Now let us ask, to whom would he entrust the

support of his parents and the care of his wife and children? Would it be the universal-minded man or the partial minded man? (Watson 44).

He charges that if the critics of universality, had to chose which type of person to trust with something important to them, such as their family, they would chose the universal minded person over the partial minded person, because there is little to no doubt the universal minded person would be more caring, and the partial minded person will be more likely to operate selfishly (Watson 44). This oxymoron makes the critics of universality somewhat hypocritical.

In response to those who suggest that a world where all people abided by universality is unattainable, Mo Zi contends that it is attainable because four sage Kings of antiquity practiced universal love and mutual aid and his understanding is patterned after theirs. One example he gives is of Kings Wen and Wu who “rewarded the worthy and punished the wicked without showing favoritism to their kin or brothers” (Watson 48). To those who suggest a society with a standard of universal love is too challenging to ever achieve, Mo Zi says, “Yet there are more difficult things that have been carried out” (Watson 49). To support this claim he mentions King Ling who loved slender waists; therefore, the people of his state ate no more than one meal a day because it pleased the King (Watson 50). The people did this “until they were too weak to stand up without a cane, or to walk without leaning against the wall” (Watson 50). He brings up King Goujian who admired bravery. Because King Goujian admired bravery “for three years he trained his soldiers and subjects to be brave”(Watson 50). To determine whether or not his soldiers had understood the real meaning of bravery he set the warships on fire then sounded the drum to advance. “ The soldiers trampled

each other down in their haste to go forward, and countless numbers of them perished in the fire and water. At the time, even though he ceased to drum them forward, they did not retreat” (Watson 50). The soldiers relegated their bodies into flames because it pleased the King. Lastly, Mo Zi tells of King Win who liked coarse clothing. Thus, while King Win reigned the men wore coarse clothing whether standing before the Duke or walking in the outer halls because it satisfied the King (Watson 50). MoZi gives examples of these perceived to be very difficult things that these ancient Kings were able to get people to do simply because it pleased the King. The people's “desire to ingratiate themselves with their superiors” resulted in the ways of the people being changed “within the space of a single generation” (Watson 50). From there he goes on to make the point that no ruler communicates to the people that universal love and a mutual benefit pleases them. Mo Zi says:

The only trouble, as I see it is that no ruler takes any delight in them. If the ruler really delights in them, promoted with reward and praise, and prevented neglect of them with punishment, then I believe that people would turn to universal love and mutual benefits as a naturally as fire turns upward or water turns downward, and nothing in the world could stop them (Watson 51).

Mo Zi believed that universal love was needed and applicable for everything from the day to day dealing of ordinary people, to the selecting of a ruler, and to the resolving of issues within and among great states. To him the standard of universal love would insure that everyone operated in a just manner from the leadership down to those under their authority (Watson 51).

Bibliography

- Ackerman, Peter and Jack DuVall. *A Force More Powerful: a century of nonviolent conflict*. New York: St.Martin's Press, 2000.
- Baumeister, Roy and Brad Bushman. *Social Psychology and Human Nature*. Belmont: Wadsworth, 2011.
- Burrow, Jr., Rufus. "Personalism, the objective moral order, and the moral law in the work of Martin Luther King, Jr." Baldwin, Lewis, Barbara Holmes and Susan Holmes Winfield. *The Legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr.: the boundaries of law, politics and Religion*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002. 213-251.
- Charles, Collyer and Jr., Ira Zepp. *Nonviolence: origins & octomes*. Victoria: Trafford, 2006.
- Collyer, Charles. "Nonviolent Living." Baltimore, 2 October 2009. Speech.
- Cone, James. *Martin & Malcolm & America: a dream or a nightmare* . Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1992.
- Gregg, Richard. *The Power of Nonviolence*. Nyack: Fellowship, 1959.
- Hurtado, Sylvia. *Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose: How Diversity Affects the Classroom Environment and Student Development*. Research. Cambridge: Harvard Education Publishing Group, 2001.
- Hurtado, Sylvia, et al. "Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: improving the climate for racial/ethnic in Higher Education." *George Washington Univ. Washington DC. Graduate School of Education and Human Development* (1999): 1-5. ERIC Digests.
- King, Jr., Martin Luther. *Stride Toward Freedom: the montgomey story*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2010.
- . *The Autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Warner Books, 1998.
- . *The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Vol. IV. Brekeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007.
- . *The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Vol. VI. Brekeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007.
- . *Where do we go from here: chaos or community*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2010.

LaFayette, Bernard and David Jehnsen. "A Structured Guide and Introduction to Kingian Nonviolence: the philosophy and methodology ." Galena: Institute for human rights and responsibilities, 1996. Manual.

Nojeim, Michael. *Gandhi and King: the power of nonviolent resistance*. Westport: Praeger, 2004.

Nygren, Anders. *Agape and Eros*. London: SPCK, 1953.

Parrinder, Geoffrey. *World Religions*. New York: Facts on File, 1971.

Partridge, Christopher. *Introduction to World Religions*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

Roberson, Quinetta M. *Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and*. CAHRS Working Paper#04-05. Ithaca: Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, 2004.

Watson, Burton. *Mozi Basic Writings*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Zepp, Ira. *The Social Vision of Martin Luther King, Jr*. Brooklyn: Carlson, 1989.